

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 NATALYA VIGDORCHIK,  
8 Plaintiff,  
9 v.  
10 LIBERTY LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY  
11 OF BOSTON, et al.,  
12 Defendants.

Case No. 19-cv-03891-HSG

**ORDER DENYING DISCOVERY**

Re: Dkt. No. 18

13 Plaintiff Natalya Vigdorchik filed this action under the Employee Retirement Income  
14 Security Act of 1974, 29 U.S.C. § 1001 *et seq.* (“ERISA”) against Defendants Liberty Life  
15 Assurance Company of Boston (“Liberty Life”) and the Wells Fargo & Company Long-Term  
16 Disability Plan (“the Plan”). Dkt. No. 1. The parties agree that the Court should apply the de  
17 novo standard of review to determine whether Plaintiff is entitled to benefits under the Plan, but  
18 disagree as to whether the Court should permit discovery. Specifically, Plaintiff seeks discovery  
19 “into the credibility, objectivity and independence of experts retained by Defendant Liberty Life.”  
20 Dkt. No. 18 at 1.

21 Because Plaintiff has not established that the circumstances in this case “clearly establish  
22 that additional evidence is necessary to conduct an adequate *de novo* review,” the Court **DENIES**  
23 Plaintiff’s request for discovery. *Mongeluzo v. Baxter Travenol Long Term Disability Ben. Plan*,  
24 46 F.3d 938, 944 (9th Cir. 1995) (citation omitted).

25 **I. LEGAL STANDARD**

26 A denial of ERISA benefits “is to be reviewed under a de novo standard unless the benefit  
27 plan gives the administrator or fiduciary discretionary authority to determine eligibility for  
28 benefits or to construe the terms of the plan.” *Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. v. Bruch*, 489 U.S.

1 101, 115 (1989); *see also Stephan v. Unum Life Ins. Co. of Am.*, 697 F.3d 917, 923 (9th Cir. 2012)  
2 (“ERISA benefit determinations are reviewed de novo, unless the benefit plan provides  
3 otherwise.”). “If de novo review applies,” then the court “proceeds to evaluate whether the plan  
4 administrator correctly or incorrectly denied benefits, without reference to whether the  
5 administrator operated under a conflict of interest.” *Abatie v. Alta Health & Life Ins. Co.*, 458  
6 F.3d 955, 963 (9th Cir. 2006).

7 A district court is usually confined to the administrative record when reviewing an ERISA  
8 claim but may, in its discretion, consider outside evidence when engaging in de novo review. *See*  
9 *id.* at 969–70. The Ninth Circuit has cautioned that the district court exercise its discretion “only  
10 when circumstances clearly establish that additional evidence is necessary to conduct an adequate  
11 *de novo* review of the benefit decision.” *Mongeluzo*, 46 F.3d at 944 (citation omitted). “In most  
12 cases, where additional evidence is not necessary for adequate review of the benefits decision, the  
13 district court should only look at the evidence that was before the plan administrator ... at the time  
14 of the determination.” *Id.* (citation omitted and alterations in original).

15 **II. DISCUSSION**

16 Plaintiff seeks to propound interrogatories to “ascertain facts relative to the number of  
17 times the particular experts use[d] in this case have submitted reports in a case where Liberty Life  
18 was a party, the amounts that such experts have earned from writing such reports, [and] the  
19 amounts that the expert witness company that purports to hire and pay these experts have been  
20 paid by Liberty Life for such services.” Dkt. No. 18 at 3. Plaintiff also asserts that it “may be  
21 necessary to depose Liberty Life personnel and/or the expert [sic] themselves.” *Id.*

22 The Court finds that Plaintiff fails to establish that the facts here constitute “exceptional  
23 circumstances” warranting discovery. *See Opeta v. Nw. Airlines Pension Plan for Contract*  
24 *Employees*, 484 F.3d 1211, 1217 (9th Cir. 2007). Courts in this district have allowed limited  
25 discovery relating to the credibility of medical examiners when a plaintiff clearly established that  
26 additional evidence was necessary to conduct an adequate de novo review. *See Brice v. Life Ins.*  
27 *Co. of N. Am.*, No. C 10-04204 JSW, 2011 WL 2837745, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. July 18, 2011)  
28 (collecting cases). Here, Plaintiff appears to argue that discovery “into the selection of the

1 insurer's experts" should automatically be permitted to "identify whether the experts hired by  
2 Liberty Life were 'independent' and 'impartial.'" Dkt. No. 18 at 2. But Plaintiff provides no  
3 specific facts suggesting that this evidence is necessary for the Court to evaluate whether Plaintiff  
4 has met her burden of establishing disability and entitlement to benefits. Whatever bias is inherent  
5 in the role of being a retained expert (for Defendant or for Plaintiff) is obvious, and does not merit  
6 discovery in a de novo review case. If the Court were to adopt Plaintiff's reasoning, it would be  
7 the "exceptional" case in which discovery would *not* be permitted. The Court does not need to  
8 consider any additional evidence about Liberty Life's experts to determine whether Plaintiff was  
9 improperly denied benefits, and thus discovery is not warranted.

10 **III. CONCLUSION**

11 The Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's request to conduct discovery. The Court **SETS** a further  
12 case management conference for December 10, 2019 at 2:00 p.m., and **DIRECTS** the parties to  
13 file on or before December 3, 2019 a stipulation and proposed order regarding a case schedule.  
14 The Court expects that the deadlines for filing briefs and the proposed hearing date will be  
15 substantially earlier than those proposed in the parties' joint case management conference  
16 statement (Dkt. No. 16 at 5), because the parties no longer need to conduct discovery between now  
17 and April 1, 2020 as proposed.

18  
19 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

20 Dated: 11/25/2019

21   
22 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.  
23 United States District Judge  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28